

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, because allegedly the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. These rejections are respectfully traversed. Claims 1 and 12 were amended to clarify that the computer program product is embodied on computer readable storage media. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this basis for objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Bansal et al., U. S. Publication No. 2007/0219842 A1). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 was amended to clarify that the alert display is displayed concurrently and adjacent to the planning board display (for support, see, inter alia, specification FIG. 8). Claim 13 was amended to clarify that the task display is displayed concurrently and adjacent to the planning board display, and the alert display is displayed concurrently and adjacent to the planning board display and the task display (for support, see, inter alia, specification FIG. 8).

Bansal fails to disclose an alert display or messages associated with scheduling information displayed using a planning board display as recited in claims 1 and 13. FIG. 2 of Bansal includes a Planned Activities frame, a Unplanned Activities frame, and a Recommended Parts frame. FIG.2 (as well as the other figures) do not include an alert display. Bansal par. 4, lines 15-18 also do not disclose or even suggest an alert display, but rather, this section states that activities can be scheduled within any given time constraints which can be imposed by service agreements with customers. Lastly, paragraph 69 of Bansal refers to the Planned Activities frame (which lists employees in relation to a daily schedule), the Unplanned Activities frame (which identifies pending activities), and the Recommended Parts frame (which identifies parts), none of which constitute an alert display as recited in the claims.

Moreover, because Bansal fails to an alert display, it also fails to disclose an alert display that is displayed concurrently and adjacent to a planning board display. Furthermore, Bansal fails to disclose that at least one message includes information associated with a constraint other than a resource constraint. As stated above, none of the frames of Bansal comprise an alert display as recited in the claims. Moreover, none of the frames of Bansal describe at least one message that includes information associated with a constraint other than a resource constraint. The Planned Activities Frame list individuals in relation to a schedule, the Unplanned Activities frame identifies folders for different types of pending activities, and the Recommended Parts frame that identifies parts recommended for use in the selected activity. None of such information can be construed to disclose the recited messages.

In addition, for claim 12, Bansal fails to suggest that at least one resource identifier represents a field technician and at least one resource identifier represents a central workshop technician. Paragraph 7 of Bansal describes scheduling of activities but is silent as to a resource identifier representing a central workshop technician. Similarly, FIG. 2 of Bansal at 270 relates to Field Engineer Activities and does not suggest a central workshop technician as recited in claim 12.

Accordingly, claims 1, 12, and their respective dependent claims should be allowable.

New claim 14 recites a graphical user interface comprising: a planning board scheduling information associated with a period of time that includes a chart identifying resources for which a user associated with the planning board is responsible; controls associated with the planning board, the controls comprising an assignment control to assign an service order item to a resource, a time specification control to identify a time period when a resource is unavailable for reasons other than an assignment, and a relationship control to create a temporary connection between a tool and a human resource; a work list providing a hierarchical view of service order items for which the user is responsible; a hot list providing a non-hierarchical list capable of displaying different views of open source items for which the user is responsible; and an alert monitor displaying a list of alerts the selection of which causes corresponding assignments displayed in the planning board that are related to the selected alert to be highlighted. (for support, see, inter alia, specification page 33, line 1 to page 36, line 16, FIG. 11).

The graphical user interface of Bansal, which comprises a Planned Activities frame, a Unplanned Activities frame, and a Recommended Parts frame, fails to disclose or otherwise suggest the subject matter of claim 14.

Accordingly, claim 14 and its dependent claims should be allowable.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-349.

Respectfully submitted,

/ck3/

Date: May 22, 2008

Carl A. Kukkonen, III
Reg. No. 42,773

Address all written correspondence to
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
5355 Mira Sorrento Place, Suite 600
San Diego, CA 92121
Customer No. 64280
Phone: 858.320.3000
Fax: 858.320.3001